



General Assembly

Official Records

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

190th MeetingMonday, 9 May 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Mongbe (Benin)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with our programme of work, we are at the final stage of our work for the current session, namely agenda item 7, regarding the consideration and adoption of reports of subsidiary bodies on the various agenda items and the draft report of the Commission as contained in documents A/CN.10/1994/CRP.2 to CRP.5.

In accordance with the agreed working timetable, we will first consider the reports of the Working Groups and of the Commission as a whole, and will then hear concluding statements by delegations.

I should like now to start the process of the consideration and adoption of the reports of subsidiary bodies on the various agenda items. I shall call on the Chairman of each Working Group to introduce the report of that Group.

We begin with the report of Working Group I, on agenda item 4, entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.3. I call on the Chairman of Working Group I, the representative of Ukraine, Mr. Volodymyr D. Khandogy, to introduce the report of that Group. Mr. Khandogy, who replaced Ambassador Batiouk, has done excellent work over the past

three weeks. Now he can bring us the fruits of those labours.

Mr. Khandogy (Ukraine), Chairman of Working Group I: I have the honour to introduce the report of Working Group I, contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.3.

Working Group I, which dealt with agenda item 4, "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons", held 11 meetings between 20 April and 6 May 1994. I, as Chairman of the Working Group, also conducted informal consultations during this period.

At the first meeting, on 20 April 1994, the Working Group decided to take the paper originally submitted by the Chairman in September 1993, and resubmitted on 20 April 1994, as a basis for discussion. That paper is contained in document A/CN.10/185.

In the course of the deliberations, I also circulated updated versions of the original paper, contained in conference room papers of Working Group I numbers 1-6, which constitute my own summary of the discussion.

In its report, Working Group I reaffirms the vital importance of nuclear disarmament in all its aspects in the framework of international peace and security and underlines the fact that the debate on the Chairman's paper was constructive.

However, despite the efforts of the Working Group, it was not possible to achieve a consensus document on the subject before the Working Group at this stage. At its 11th meeting, on 6 May 1994, the Working Group nevertheless decided to recommend that the item entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons" be included in the agenda of the Disarmament Commission for conclusion at its 1995 session.

It is not really surprising that this year, which in fact was the first year of substantive work, we could not manage to come to an agreement on the complex issue of nuclear disarmament. But we vigorously explored the possibility of a consensus and we now understand each others' positions better. Delegations have come closer to an understanding on a number of issues, and I think that the Working Group has laid a promising foundation for the discussion of this agenda item in the future.

I should like to pay tribute to all delegations which during our deliberations tried to help me to build consensus on this complex and difficult issue. Their comments, proposals and recommendations gave me a chance to improve the original Chairman's paper considerably and to make of it a viable basis for the discussion next year. I hope that the results of our deliberations will not be lost or forgotten.

Let me also express my appreciation, Sir, for your flattering words about my efforts as the Chairman of Working Group I, which have encouraged me throughout our work.

Finally, I should like to express my gratitude to the Secretary of Working Group I, Mr. Timur Alasaniya, and to other staff members of the Secretariat who have helped us in this important endeavour.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As Mr. Khandogy says, we should not view the results of Working Group I as a failure. On the contrary, we believe that the work done over the past three weeks is a promising basis for future work. We have been able to go into the subject in depth for the first time. It is a very sensitive matter, and some time is needed for work on it to reach an advanced stage.

If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report

(A/CN.10/1994/CRP.3) of Working Group I on item 4 regarding nuclear disarmament.

The report was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We now move on to the report of Working Group II on item 5, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", as contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.4.

In inviting the Chairman of Working Group II, Ambassador Peggy Mason, the representative of Canada, to introduce the report of Working Group II, I should like to congratulate her on her efforts, which continued right up to the last minute, to reach a consensus text. We are all familiar with her talents; she showed a great deal of wisdom and political goodwill in trying to obtain consensus, but unfortunately it appears that the time is still not ripe for consensus on this important subject. None the less, we feel that, thanks to her efforts, the work is almost complete.

Ms. Mason (Canada), Chairman of Working Group II (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Sir, for your introduction. I shall be as brief as possible.

(spoke in English)

I have the honour to introduce the report of Working Group II on agenda item 5. It is contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.4, as revised and adopted by the Working Group at its 12th meeting this morning. I should like briefly to go through that report, indicating in particular the revisions that were made in the course of the last meeting of the Working Group this morning.

The item that the Working Group dealt with is agenda item 5, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". Paragraph 2 of CRP.4 indicates the documents that Working Group II had before it as a result of the four years of its work. I would draw attention in particular to paragraph 2 (s), which has been revised to read

"Chairman's working papers
(A/CN.10/1994/WG.II/CRP.2-10)".

That change reflects documents which are to be circulated as a result of the agreement reached this morning in the Working Group.

CRP.8 will be recirculated with an asterisk, with a footnote reading "Reissued for technical reasons". CRP.9 will reflect what was in the annex to the version of CRP.4 that delegations had before them this morning. That annex has now been deleted, but its contents will now appear as CRP.9. CRP.10, which will appear under the title "Chairman's proposed annex", will be the same, in respect of paragraph 12, as CRP.8 with the asterisk.

That is what is behind the changes to the Working Group papers that delegations have before them, and thus paragraph 2 (s) indicates the working papers that Working Group II had before it throughout its work this year.

I turn now to paragraph 3, which should begin:

"The Working Group held 12 meetings between 20 April and 9 May ...".

The rest of the paragraph remains as it was in the original CRP.4, circulated in the Working Group this morning; the only change is to the number and dates of the meetings.

Paragraph 4, of course, is unchanged. It relates the agreement of the Working Group to base its deliberation on the Chairman's working paper, which was contained in annex III to last year's report of the Disarmament Commission.

Paragraph 5 sets out the working method agreed in our first organizational meeting: discussion primarily on those areas where we had been unable to formulate a consensus text, beginning with the brackets contained in part III of the Chairman's working paper, then re-examining other bracketed paragraphs of other parts of the text, and then looking at the working paper as a whole.

Paragraphs 6 and 7 represent a revision of the paragraph 6 that appeared in the original CRP.4. They were revised and agreed on in the Working Group this morning, in accordance with the following text, paragraph 6 now reading:

"With reference to the document addressed by the Working Group as a basis for discussion during the session, it was not possible to reach a consensus on guidelines and recommendations on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields."

Paragraph 7 reads:

"At its 12th meeting, on 9 May 1994, the Working Group adopted by consensus its report to the Disarmament Commission on agenda item 5, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields."

This concludes the formal presentation of the report of Working Group II as adopted by the Working Group at its 12th meeting, held this morning, but I should like later to make a few comments from the Chair's perspective.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Commission owes a debt of gratitude to Ambassador Mason, because she has spent much valuable time trying to harmonize opinions on this very sensitive issue. She has made an enormous step forward in the negotiations, and I am sure that when they have read the report carefully members of the Commission will be very grateful to her. We therefore continue to be optimistic.

If there are no comments on the report, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1994/CRP.4) of Working Group II on agenda item 5 regarding the role of science and technology in the field of disarmament.

The report was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now invite Ambassador Mason to make her comments.

Ms. Mason (Canada), Chairman of Working Group II: I will be very brief.

Before we leave this item, I wish to recall first the brief remarks I made last year, when I said what an extraordinary privilege it was to chair last year's drafting group. I noted at that time that the efforts of delegations from every region and every grouping to overcome our differences and to find agreement exemplified, in my view, exactly what the Disarmament Commission is all about. To my mind, this statement applies with even greater force to this year's work.

It seems that the efforts of Working Group II, in its fourth and final year, have perhaps demonstrated - from my perspective, at least - both the best and the worst of what we are capable of accomplishing. In my view, the many moved from what I think could be accurately described at the end of last year as a very fragile near-consensus to a much less fragile one this year, but of course that is not

enough, and we are all well aware of that. For many to embrace the text is not enough; all must be able to do so, and therefore we failed in our ultimate objective. I as Chairman failed in guiding representatives to that end, and we collectively failed in reaching that end.

Despite this, however, it continues to be my view that this effort was and is worthwhile. I therefore express my profound appreciation to delegations for the privilege accorded me of chairing this Working Group this year. I would commend, of course, the report to delegations, and in particular, for any who are interested in the details of the negotiations, I recommend in particular paragraph 2 (s), which contains the history of the negotiations, including, ultimately, their failure.

In thanking every delegation here - and I do so unreservedly - I am sure delegations will understand if I take this opportunity to particularly thank the delegation of Brazil. While the whole delegation was of great support, again delegations will understand if I thank in particular Edmundo Fujita for his support, guidance and cooperation throughout. I think that he will forgive me if I note his dedication to the task entrusted to him. He participated in every stage, notwithstanding the fact that he was also covering the Security Council at the same time. I single him out because I think he has demonstrated the kind of commitment to the Disarmament Commission that has convinced me that the effort is worthwhile.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I agree with the Chairman of Working Group II that the effort was worth making, and she made this effort with the Working Group. Last year's very fragile consensus is now less fragile, and we hope that in future sessions we will be able to reach final consensus.

We shall now to take up the report of Working Group III on item 6, entitled "International arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H of 6 December 1991", contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.5. It gives me great pleasure to call on Ambassador Luis Fernando Jaramillo, Permanent Representative of Colombia, to present the report. His delegation was responsible for this item's being on the agenda. Everyone recognizes that the delegation of Colombia has done a great deal for this Commission.

Mr Jaramillo (Colombia), Chairman of Working Group III (*interpretation from Spanish*): When Working Group III began consideration of international arms transfers, with particular reference to General Assembly

resolution 46/36 H, it was hoped that in our first six initial meetings we would have a broad exchange of ideas on this issue, and that we could attempt to lay the groundwork for future, more detailed consideration in the Working Group in 1995 and 1996. With that in mind, we held meetings in which all members of the Working Group actively participated. Several important documents were presented, important both because of their content and because they helped us to better clarify and define the issue. I therefore believe that we have attained the Group's initial goal of carrying out a preliminary examination of this issue and beginning to set some parameters for work in future years.

Annexed to the Group's report is a document submitted by the Chairman, intended to reflect, from the Chairman's viewpoint, the most important items considered by the participants in the Working Group, or items thought to be relevant to our discussion. I repeat that it reflects how the Chairman saw the discussion; it is his attempt to take into account every matter considered relevant for future discussions.

I would like to thank all the participants in our meetings, and especially to mention the work done over many years, but at this session in particular, by my compatriot, Graciela Lozano, who has been a leader on this issue and for some six years has insisted on the importance of discussing it in the Disarmament Commission. This discussion has now begun, and I think it has got off to a good start, with the Colombian delegation making an excellent contribution. I am optimistic that ultimately, at the end of our discussions, we will be able to make recommendations and highlight positive points to serve as a basis for controlling weapons that have caused mankind so much suffering and pain.

I believe that less than 30 per cent of mankind recalls the year of the last atomic bomb explosion; approximately 70 per cent of the inhabitants of Earth have been born since then. However, every day hundreds and thousands die for one reason or another as a result of the use of small arms conventional weapons. It is food for thought that although weapons of mass destruction are much more conspicuous and sophisticated, small conventional weapons really cause more death, destruction and pain to mankind.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mrs. Graciela Lozano, who sometimes assumed the chairmanship of Working Group III.

The Group has done some excellent preliminary work. The Chairman's document, annexed to the report, will be very useful for the substantive debate at future sessions. We are therefore grateful to the Colombian delegation for having completed this excellent work, which will make it possible to tackle one of the scourges that I denounced in my opening statement, when I said that it was not just nuclear weapons that must be destroyed, but all weapons, especially conventional weapons, in which there are all kinds of illicit trafficking and smuggling and which cause so much damage and so much grief in our countries.

Ambassador Jaramillo and his Group did outstanding work, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Such work does not surprise me, for as Chairman of the Group of 77 last year he consistently paid careful attention to detail, whether in the social, economic or human rights fields. In Vienna, Geneva and New York, Ambassador Jaramillo has always lived up to our expectations.

Mr. Jaramillo (Colombia), Chairman of Working Group III (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to draw attention to a small editorial detail. I would ask the secretariat to delete the underlining in the Chairman's working paper contained in the report of Working Group III in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.5. The underlining was simply intended to reflect references I made in the Chairman's working paper, but it need not remain in the document.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): That comment is noted. The underlining will be deleted.

If there is no further comment, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1994/CRP.5) of Working Group III on item 6 regarding international arms transfers.

The report was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Now that we have adopted all the reports of the Commission's subsidiary bodies, I should like to thank the Chairmen of the various Working Groups for their efforts in considering their subjects, and for their spirit of cooperation in carrying out the tasks entrusted to them by the General Assembly.

Are there any general comments on the three reports we have just adopted?

Mr. Laviña (Philippines): First, I should like to join you, Sir, in congratulating the Chairmen of the Working

Groups. We thank them for their hard work, dedication and commitment.

We very much appreciate the papers submitted by the Chairmen of the various Working Groups. But we have long been in the business of meetings and conferences, and it has been a rare experience to see almost all the reports bare shells without reference to the critical issues discussed during the debates. In other words, the reports did not reflect what actually took place in the various Working Groups, nor did they take into account the positions of various delegations on the issues.

We wonder whether the Commission is afraid to state the positions of delegations or whether, at the very least, it did not wish to complicate the reports. But the barrenness or meagreness of the reports seems to indicate that it is not prepared to state the various positions of delegations. We hope that in our future sessions we will decide to review the format of the reports and include in them the divergent positions taken by delegations on critical issues.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): For the time being, I believe that the reports are in an acceptable form. I do not think that it is the right time to bring our differences of opinion to light. It is much more useful to stress what brings us closer. We still have a long way to go in resolving these sensitive issues, and I believe that the reports were drafted and introduced very wisely.

I agree with the representative of the Philippines that it would be more democratic for us to express various views, but there would have been too many differences. We know how the press jumps upon that sort of thing. Let us, rather, be more optimistic than to think that the future is grim. I sincerely believe that the present format of the reports is appropriate for the time being.

We are now in a position to take up the draft report of the Disarmament Commission for consideration, as contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.2. I call on the Rapporteur of the Disarmament Commission to introduce that report.

Mr. Ovalle (Chile), Rapporteur of the Disarmament Commission (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is my honour to introduce to the Disarmament Commission the draft report of the Commission on its current session, as contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.2, which is before members of the Commission for consideration.

In conformity with previous practice, the draft report contains four chapters: Introduction, Organization and work of the 1994 session, Documentation, and Conclusions and recommendations. As in previous years, the document presents a factual description of the Commission's work and proceedings during this session. With regard to the substantive work done by the subsidiary bodies of the Commission, the relevant sections will contain the reports of the three Working Groups which have just been adopted by the Commission.

As members will note, some information has been left blank in the draft report at this stage. I propose that we leave it to the Secretariat to complete the text with meeting numbers and dates as appropriate.

In my view, this session of the Disarmament Commission has in general been a successful one. There has been not only the conclusion of one agenda item - "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields" - but also a good beginning on the new one - "International arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H of 6 December 1991". On the other hand, there were mixed results on the item regarding nuclear disarmament, which fell somewhat below our expectations. However, the decision to postpone that item for another year could be a good solution in view of the forthcoming important 1995 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This means that, at next year's session of the Disarmament Commission, much work will remain to be done to finalize the item on nuclear issues.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt thanks to the members of the Secretariat for the assistance and cooperation they provided to me in the preparation of the draft report of the Commission. In particular, I should like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. In addition, I wish to offer sincere thanks to Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, Secretary of the Disarmament Commission, and his colleagues for their valuable assistance and cooperation.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize that it was a great honour and privilege for me to have served under your distinguished and effective leadership and to have received the fullest cooperation of the Chairmen of the three Working Groups, who so ably guided the deliberations of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission during this session.

With that introduction, I now recommend that the Commission adopt the draft report.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): We shall now consider the draft report of the Commission paragraph by paragraph.

Are there any comments on paragraph 1, which contains the text of resolution 48/77 A, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission"? In French this ends on page 4. If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt this paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 were adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): We now turn to paragraph 4, contained in chapter II, "Organization and work of the 1994 substantive session". There are a few typographical errors in the English version, but they are not serious, and the secretariat will take care of them. If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the paragraph.

Paragraph 4 was adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraphs 5 to 8.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): The secretariat will fill in the blanks in paragraphs 9 and 10 regarding the number of meetings. If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 9.

Paragraph 9 was adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): The English version of paragraph 10 should be corrected to read "Her Excellency" before "Ms. Peggy Mason (Canada)".

Ms. Mason (Canada), Chairman of Working Group II: I wish to speak not with respect to that addition, for which I am grateful; at least until I get back to Ottawa I trust that I still have that title.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): I thank Ambassador Peggy Mason for that reminder. Thus, the blank should be filled in with the number 12.

Mr. Akalovsky (United States of America): I should like to make a strictly factual correction. The twelfth

meeting was today, so it was not on 6 May, as paragraph 10 would state, but on 9 May.

Ms. Mason (Canada), Chairman of Working Group II: I thank my American colleague for that correction. It was one of the corrections that I made orally when I introduced the report today. In other words, as it was adopted this morning the report contained that revision, but I neglected to mention it again when I spoke about the 12 meetings.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): That is so, and the Secretariat will take due note.

If there are no further comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 10.

Paragraph 10, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraphs 11 and 12.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 were adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): We turn now to paragraph 13.

Mr. Laviña (Philippines): The paragraph refers to the fact that "some non-governmental organizations attended". Do we not need to indicate their observer capacity? Obviously, they could not attend as representatives.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): Such an expression is to be found in all our reports for some years. It is true that the non-governmental organizations do not enjoy the same status as delegations in our work, but we recognize their presence and traditionally mention it in the report. Therefore, I do not think the representative of the Philippines will maintain any objection to this paragraph, which is in conformity with our precedents, and I thank him for his understanding.

Ms. Mason (Canada): It seems to me that as the word used is "attended", not "participated", a distinction is made between attendance by non-governmental organizations and participation by delegations. I think that is why that formulation has been used over the years without any further qualification.

Mr. Khandogy (Ukraine): Were any meetings of the Committee of the Whole held? Paragraph 13 refers to non-governmental organizations having attended meetings of the Committee of the Whole, but this morning's scheduled meeting of the Committee of the Whole did not take place.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): There was not time this morning for the meeting of the Committee of the Whole decided on by the Disarmament Commission. Everyone knows the conditions under which we were working this morning. That reference will be deleted from the text of paragraph 13. I thank the representative of Ukraine for his vigilance.

May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 13, as orally corrected?

Paragraph 13, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): We turn now to part III, "Documentation", paragraphs 14 to 18. May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt those paragraphs?

Paragraphs 14 to 18 were adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): We turn now to part IV, "Conclusions and recommendations", paragraphs 19 to 23. Are there any comments on these paragraphs?

Mr. Akalovsky (United States of America): I have no wish to be pedantic, but with respect to paragraph 20 I would note that the Commission is adopting its report - singular - to the General Assembly, not its "reports" as written in the draft text.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United States for his vigilance. The correction will be made in all languages to which it applies.

May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt part IV of the draft report?

Paragraphs 19 to 23, as orally corrected, were adopted.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): Now that all paragraphs of the draft report have been adopted, I would like to take up the draft report of the Commission as a whole, with all reports of the subsidiary bodies

inserted therein. May I take it that it is the wish of the Commission to adopt the draft report of the Commission as a whole, as contained in document A/CN.10/1994/CRP.2, as orally corrected?

The draft report, as orally corrected, was adopted.

Concluding statements

Mr. Griffin (Australia): In reviewing the work of the Disarmament Commission at its 1994 session, Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to record its appreciation for your work and that of the other members of the Bureau. In particular, admiration and respect are due to Mr. Khandogy and Ambassador Mason, whose perseverance, patience and infinite resourcefulness in the chairs of Working Groups I and II deserved to be rewarded with consensus outcomes and are exemplary of the constructive and dedicated approach their respective countries bring to bear on the work of the United Nations and the multilateral system. Their work was compared by more than one delegation to the labours of Hercules, but at times they must have felt more akin to Sisyphus.

Our compliments and appreciation are also due to the members of the secretariat who have worked with us over the last three weeks. Their professionalism and commitment have been an invaluable support.

It is deeply disappointing to my delegation that, after the years of work devoted by this Commission to the important issues of science and technology and nuclear disarmament, consensus outcomes on both issues continue to elude us. At a time of profound change and considerable flux in the international political and security environment, when unprecedented opportunities have opened up in the disarmament field, it is important for the continued *raison d'être* of this Commission that it demonstrate relevance and leadership with respect to the disarmament and arms control processes under way in a range of forums.

It can best do this, as we have pointed out in the past, by developing balanced, broadly expressed general assessments, principles and recommendations to guide the work of other bodies. Over-emphasis on detail and the defence of detailed national positions will not advance our work, the interests of the Commission as an institution or the common disarmament goals of the international community.

My delegation, for example, has strong positions of principle on some of the most contentious issues which have bedevilled the work of Working Groups I and II, notably the questions of non-proliferation and related safeguards and export-control regimes. Yet in the interest of consensus we have been prepared to accept and to propose general language on these issues which was less than ideal from our national standpoint.

My delegation regrets that, despite sustained efforts by a large number of delegations, consensus was blocked in Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, on the question of recommending the Chairman's final working paper (A/CN.10/1994/WG.I/CRP.6) to next year's session of the Commission. Despite this setback, we believe that considerable progress was made in refining and improving the working paper, to the point where it now contains the elements of a consensus document. It is important that this process be consolidated and built upon. My delegation strongly urges, therefore, that the Commission take that working paper as its starting point when it returns to this item next year. If the principles and approach are brought to bear, it should be possible to turn that document into the consensus view of this universal body on one of the most important issues of our time.

The efforts over the last four years in Working Group II, on science and technology, demonstrate that, despite the fact that a final consensus document was not achieved, there is a large degree of common ground in respect of the issues under this item. The vast majority of the Chair's working paper did indeed command consensus, and we should not lose sight of the importance of these areas of agreement.

Australia attaches particular importance to the principle, set out in the working paper, that transfers of high technology with military applications should not undermine international security, or deny access to science and technology for peaceful purposes. We take very seriously our obligation under global non-proliferation instruments - the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the chemical weapons Convention (CWC) and the biological weapons Convention (BWC) - to ensure that our trade in science and technology does not assist in the development and acquisition of the weapons of mass destruction concerned, and note that national licensing measures based on non-proliferation commitments are in active compliance with this obligation. We are equally committed to the provisions under global non-proliferation treaties that deal with economic and technological development. It would be impossible, of course, to sustain any impediment to

commercial trade without a legitimate, specific reason connected with obligations under such treaties.

We pay tribute to Ambassador Mason of Canada, who deserves congratulations on the exemplary manner in which she dealt with the complex and controversial topics raised in the science and technology Working Group. In our view, Ambassador Mason succeeded in achieving the maximum possible outcome on this item, and we salute her efforts.

We have had a useful first exchange on the issue of international arms transfers. We pay tribute here to the unrelenting efforts of the delegation of Colombia in moving this issue forward. As the report of Working Group III notes, there remain differences between delegations on the scope of our work in this area. These will be addressed further in our future discussions. It remains our view that, while we should focus on illicit arms transfers, this matter needs to be set initially in its broader context. At the end of the day, however, we need to develop and agree on viable and feasible guidelines for practical action to address illicit arms transfers.

Mr. Collins (Ireland): I am grateful for the opportunity to speak, the more particularly since this is probably my last public statement in the United Nations. I have, of course, one or two private statements or comments to make. The victims, in precise terms, have yet to be decided.

That being said, I wanted to make a relatively short speech. The United Nations Disarmament Commission is a deliberative body. We have, it is obvious, done much deliberation. That is what this body should do. We have not arrived at a consensus which can be immediately useful. On the other hand, deliberation and reflection are always useful. We have not, therefore, completely wasted our time.

Equally, however, there comes a time to stop playing games. During this session of the Disarmament Commission, too many people have been playing games. They cover the spectrum from left to right, from east to west, from north to south. I am aware, as is every representative in this room, that we all have our instructions. That is a fact, and we should not comment on the specifics of the instructions.

On the other hand, when you join an international organization or any other democratic system, you make your views available for inspection. It is the view of my

delegation that some people around this room have not done a good job for their people. I am sorry to speak so bluntly, but I have done so and I do not take it back. If they think that nobody has noticed, they are mistaken.

I want now to turn to the details and specifics, and I wish to say the following on the issue of science and technology.

We regret that, after four years, the United Nations Disarmament Commission has been unable to adopt an agreed text on this important issue. We especially thank Ambassador Mason for her untiring and Herculean efforts, which came very close to success. We regret that we could not agree to annexing the results of our work to the report. It would have served as a useful record of what we have achieved. We trust nevertheless that it will serve as a basis for future work in relevant forums.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): The representative of Ireland said that he had spoken bluntly, and I think we are of like mind. I recognize and understand his position.

Mr. Hou Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): As the 1994 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission draws to a close, I wish, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, to thank you, Sir, for your effective chairmanship and contribution. I wish to thank also the Bureau and Ambassador Batiouk and Mr. Khandogy of Ukraine, Ambassador Mason of Canada and Ambassador Jaramillo of Colombia and to express our appreciation for their efforts and contributions to the work of the leading Working Groups. At the same time, I should like to thank the Director of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic, and Mr. Lin, the Secretary of the Commission, for their very helpful support. Our thanks also go to the Secretariat and all the interpreters and translators for their effective cooperation.

In the past three weeks this Commission, in a conscientious and pragmatic atmosphere, has carried out in-depth and detailed deliberations on the three items before it at this session, and achieved positive results. The constructive discussion on international arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H, and the paper submitted by the Chairman at the end, serve as a good basis for future deliberations.

The item entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and

other related fields" has received another round of in-depth deliberations, and consensus is now close. The Chinese delegation is of the view that, although full consensus could not be reached on the document, the last four years of pragmatic deliberations have, as a whole, been beneficial and constructive.

We agree with Ambassador Mason that these efforts have been worthwhile. We take the view that the important principles and proposals on which consensus has already been reached and which are contained in this document will still play a guiding role in the future in this important field.

The item entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons" is one to which all sides attach priority importance. The deliberations this year have further enhanced mutual understanding. Therefore, the Commission has unanimously decided to prolong these deliberations for a year. We believe that, with the joint efforts of all countries, we will be able next year to attain positive results acceptable to all sides.

With the development of the international situation, the international community is even more concerned with further strengthening international peace and security. It has high hopes of the Disarmament Commission. The work of the Commission in the past few years has demonstrated that, since its reform, its work is increasingly rational and is becoming more pragmatic and effective.

In our view, reform and rationalization are not a one-shot occurrence whereby results can be accomplished once and for all. It is, rather, an evolutionary and cumulative process. We are convinced that with the joint efforts of all countries, the Disarmament Commission, as the sole fully representative multilateral disarmament deliberative body, will have its vitality strengthened, and that it will play an increasingly important role in international disarmament and security.

China has always attached importance to the Disarmament Commission and has participated actively in its work. In the future, the Chinese delegation will, as in the past, together with all other delegations, make new contributions towards further strengthening the Disarmament Commission's role in promoting disarmament, arms control and international security.

Mr. Arai (Japan): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to make just a few remarks on the work relating

to the role of science and technology. I deeply regret that agreement could not be reached on this important subject despite the efforts we have made over the last four years under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Mason of Canada. As we all recognized from the very outset of our deliberations, the question of access to dual-use technology is a delicate one. The accommodation of contradictory views - the consent of the suppliers' group regarding non-proliferation and the interest of the recipients' group in having easy access to science and technology for peaceful purposes - has proved very difficult indeed.

Although we were not able to formulate a consensus text, I am convinced that our efforts in drafting guidelines and recommendations on this issue will prove useful in many respects, because in that process we did manage to find common ground for both suppliers and recipients in some important areas. I note in particular our tentative agreement on paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Chairman's paper, which represents a major step in the right direction.

Finally, I would like to commend the efforts made and professionalism shown by Ambassador Mason throughout the deliberations of the relevant Working Group.

Mrs. Lozano (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation joins others, Sir, in expressing its gratitude to you and to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups for the outstanding manner in which this session of the Disarmament Commission has been conducted.

We regret that the great efforts of the Chairman of Working Group I, Mr. Khandogy, which have been described as herculean, did not lead to guidelines acceptable to all delegations. This is no surprise to my delegation, since it is not possible to arrive at a consensus text when one starts from two diametrically opposed viewpoints - on the one hand, an attempt to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and, on the other, an approach focused only on horizontal proliferation, thus sidestepping the very issue entrusted to this Working Group: nuclear disarmament. As long as there is no agreement on what we are attempting to achieve as the fruit of our work, I fear that the exercise cannot have a happy outcome.

The same contradiction emerged over paragraph 12 of the various versions of the working papers of the Chairman of Working Group II, and with the same regrettable results. All the elements of the paper - the fruit of four years of work - were agreed upon by delegations, except for the one that reflects the various viewpoints on non-proliferation. Although there was no consensus on that working paper,

my delegation feels that it makes a useful contribution, as it contains valuable recommendations for States Members of the United Nations. In that respect, I would like to express the admiration and the gratitude of my delegation for the tireless efforts of Ambassador Peggy Mason, for her patience and for all of her intellectual and human qualities, which made possible such positive contributions from so many delegations. In particular, I would like to reiterate what Ambassador Mason said about the attitude and the especially constructive participation of the delegation of Brazil.

My delegation was particularly encouraged by the constructive debate during the six meetings of Working Group III. We hope that the working paper submitted by Colombia has contributed, as intended, to the dynamism of our discussions. My delegation is pleased that the working paper of the Chairman of that Group has been annexed to the Group's report and that it will constitute a starting-point for the discussions by that Group in the future. We feel that, while this paper represents the viewpoints of the Chairman, it also reflects many of the ideas expressed by delegations as they were presented in various working papers.

We would like to express our gratitude to all delegations for their positive participation in this Working Group, and to you, Mr. Chairman, and the Secretariat for the support and assistance we have received.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I am happy to hear the representative of Colombia express so much optimism about the future of our work.

Mr. Ponce (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We are concluding this session with some disappointment, in view of the limited results achieved.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Khandogy of Ukraine, Working Group I made some progress, though we regret that lack of general agreement on the Chairman's paper made its inclusion in the Group's report impossible.

Ecuador, as a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), reaffirms the full value of its text, one of whose objectives is

"the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the liquidation of all their existing stockpiles, and the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery pursuant to a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and

effective international control" (*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex, eleventh preambular paragraph*).

Any attempts to ignore this aspiration of the international community and reduce the question of nuclear disarmament simply to a recitation of the results achieved thus far and favour partial measures of non-horizontal proliferation are doomed to failure and will not receive the support of the international community. We trust that at our next session we will achieve the necessary balance between measures aimed at avoiding proliferation and those aimed at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, and that the Commission will thus carry out its mandate.

At the last session of the Commission my delegation affirmed that

"consensus is the practical reflection of a successful diplomatic negotiation and that in no case can it be an illegal mechanism for the creation - without saying so - of a new veto system." (*A/CN.10/PV.180, p. 26*)

The results of Working Group II, which considered science and technology in the context of international security, have shown the growing need to review, at least in specific procedural matters, the rigid practice of consensus, which has prevented a text that had been worked on so painstakingly over the past four years, document CRP.9 - the final version of which reflected the viewpoint of the Chairman of that Group concerning the outcome of the negotiations - from being reflected in the final report of our session and from being available for use by the international community in appropriate forums and on appropriate occasions. The best way to sap the efforts of the Disarmament Commission is to continue to venerate the notion of consensus. It is up to the immense majority of delegations, which appreciate the work of this body, to adopt the necessary procedural reforms to ensure against that.

I think it relevant to conclude by thanking Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada for her tireless efforts. I share her tribute to the constancy and creativity of the delegation of Brazil. Its example has given us cause to believe that with determination and ability, and with the competent support of the Secretariat, this Commission will be able to overcome the problems we have had to face at the session currently concluding.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Ecuador for his positive, encouraging words about the results of our work.

Mr. Salmi (Finland): Let me first associate myself with all those who have thanked you, Sir, and the Bureau and the secretariat for the work done to ensure the success of this session. I also associate myself with those who believe in the principle of putting aside strict national positions and working to strengthen common ground and achieve common goals, as my Australian colleague so eloquently put it.

My delegation finds itself with mixed feelings after this session. First of all, in Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, it seemed to us that we never really came very close to consensus. As we are now living in the middle of a historic nuclear disarmament process, we expected this deliberative body to be more capable of playing its role in strengthening the common ground for further work on nuclear disarmament. In our view, any meaningful result in this area must take into account positive developments in the real world in all those negotiations that have either been concluded or are under way. We hope that the Working Group on nuclear disarmament will manage to conclude its work during next year's session. To this end, some progress was made. The Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. Khandogy of Ukraine, made admirable efforts aimed at approaching consensus. We believe that the working paper, Conference Room Paper 6, offers a good basis to continue work during the next session.

We regret even more that the Working Group on science and technology was ultimately not able to overcome the impasse relating to the transfer of high technology with military applications. A great effort was made to reach meaningful compromise language in this area, but, finally, to our great disappointment, we did not succeed.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Chairperson of our Group, Ambassador Mason, for her tireless and courageous struggle to say what had to be said of its four years' work. I would also like to join others in thanking the delegation of Brazil for the exemplary role it played in this work.

Any discussion of the transfer of high technology with military applications must take into account the existing situation, existing institutions, the existing treaties and arrangements, supporting non-proliferation objectives. Anything else, in the view of our delegation, would be somewhat theoretical and not productive. We regret that this approach was not approved by all.

The Commission's role may have been undermined, but we do not believe that the role and meaning of the non-proliferation regimes have been undermined through this.

As for the third Working Group, on international arms transfers, we had a preliminary debate this year exploring appropriate, feasible, desirable approaches to that problem, and we found some common ground. I heartily thank, of course, the Chairman of our Working Group and the delegation of Colombia for what they did in taking this question up and preparing our work.

As far as next year's session is concerned, my delegation looks forward, first of all, to finally reaching consensus on nuclear disarmament, and also to continuing a meaningful discussion on international arms transfers.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I share the views of the representative of Finland and his words of optimism in hoping that the Commission will conclude its work at the next session at the latest.

Ms. Duncan (New Zealand): In addition to expressing my delegation's appreciation to you, Sir, to the other members of the Bureau, and to the secretariat for all your work during this year's session, I want to associate my delegation with the comments in the statement by the representative of Australia. In particular, I wish to join him and other delegations who have paid special tribute to the Chair of the science and technology Working Group, Ambassador Peggy Mason. We agree with her observation that the efforts made to secure common ground in this very difficult field have been worthwhile.

Like you, Mr. Chairman, my delegation believes that it is important to look forward. All delegations participating in this Commission have a responsibility to ensure that in its future work the Commission justifies the resources devoted to it. It can do this only by producing practical results in a timely fashion. And it is this sort of outcome that my delegation will be looking for at next year's session in relation to the important subject of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Rydberg (Sweden) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation, I should like first to convey our sincere thanks and congratulations to you, Sir, to the other members of the Bureau, to the secretariat, and to the three Chairmen of the Working Groups: Mr. Khandogy of

Ukraine, Ms. Mason of Canada and Mr. Jaramillo of Colombia.

(spoke in English)

It is not through your lack of effort and dedication, Sir, that the overall result of this session is disappointing. The task of the session was a difficult one: to conclude two controversial and complex items on our agenda. The Commission concluded neither. Working Group I on nuclear disarmament had, maybe, a particularly difficult assignment, given the nature of its topic. My delegation appreciates that, in spite of this, some progress was clearly made, though, regrettably, not enough. We support the recommendation of the Working Group that the item be included in the Disarmament Commission's agenda for conclusion in 1995. The last Chairman's paper constitutes, in our view, a good basis for an additional attempt to reach a consensus text.

As for Working Group II, on the role of science and technology, the efforts of Ambassador Mason over recent years to find a way to bridge differences of opinion merit particular acknowledgment. A study of her successive Chairman's working papers - 10 in all one, to be on the safe side, with an asterisk version - would indeed show that a narrowing of positions has taken place in the group.

Fundamental differences do, however, remain, in particular on the crucial issue of wider adherence to treaties on non-proliferation - specifically, the Non-Proliferation Treaty. These differences are profound and substantial, and did not, as was clearly demonstrated in the Group, lend themselves to being papered over with opaque language. The annexation of the Chairman's final working paper to the report of the Working Group would, in our opinion, have shown both where progress had been made and where disagreement remained. We regret that the Working Group was not able to agree to such an annexation.

Working Group III began its work on the new item on illegal arms transfers with a useful exchange of opinion, in particular on the scope of the item. My delegation hopes that next year the Working Group will be able to complete its definition of the appropriate scope of this topic and begin its substantive deliberations on the topic. The Chairman's working paper will, as stated in the report of the Working Group, be one element for future consideration.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that the problems encountered at this session will lead to an

appropriate evaluation of how the Disarmament Commission can best play its proper role within the United Nations disarmament machinery.

Mr. Chtcherbak (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: The delegation of the Russian Federation wishes first to thank you, Sir, the other members of the Bureau and the secretariat for the work done in coordinating our efforts to achieve the results we have achieved. We would also like to emphasize in particular the efforts of the Chairmen of the Working Groups: Mr. Jaramillo of Colombia, Mr. Khandogy of Ukraine and Ms. Mason of Canada.

The Russian Federation is of course disappointed that we were unable to achieve the desired results in our consideration of the documents of Working Groups I and II. My delegation attached great importance to reaching consensus on the matters before those Groups and worked actively and systematically, in cooperation with other delegations, to achieve a consensus text. As members know, we did not succeed, and we are compelled to note that we did not obtain the hoped-for results on these papers.

Our delegation agrees with the assessments made by the delegations of Japan, Australia, Sweden, Finland, Ireland and others. We hope that we will manage next year to achieve the desired results in our discussion of the issues relating to nuclear disarmament. Our delegation wishes to stress that we believe that there are lessons to be learned from the results of this session. Its work, we believe, would have benefitted from more flexible working methods that would enable delegations, while maintaining their national positions of principle, to reach compromise results with regard to the adoption of documents that would make concrete contributions to international security and disarmament.

I should now like to say a few words about the future of our work. As members know, we have two items planned for the next session. We will continue to consider nuclear disarmament and international arms transfers in the context of the prohibition of illicit transfers. We believe that there is enormous potential for activity and for adopting the relevant papers, but at the same time we all need immediately to consider the next items to be included on the Commission's agenda. The Commission's work is entering a more complex and qualitatively new stage in which expertise, the detailed elaboration of positions in capitals, creativity and many other elements will be required in order for us to achieve results and work effectively within the Commission.

We believe that the key to improving our work at the next session of the Commission is for us to establish the best possible agenda.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for his encouraging comments about the conclusion of our work and his specific proposals for the future.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): First of all, my delegation would like to join previous speakers in expressing appreciation to you, Sir, and to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups and the secretariat - in particular, Mr. Lin, Mr. Sattar and Mr. Alasaniya - for their tireless efforts and dedication.

I shall attempt to assess briefly the work of the three Working Groups.

With respect to Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, some issues prevented us from reaching a consensus, or at least from attaching the Chairman's paper to the report of the Working Group. Some of the issues that prevented the Working Group from coming closer to a consensus document were: the broad scope of the topic; the lack of a balanced document with which to begin negotiations; perhaps the late consideration of this document - we actually engaged in the deliberations on this document in this, the third year of its consideration; and attempts to introduce ambiguous new norms into this process, attempts to erode past achievements of the United Nations in the field of nuclear disarmament and also attempts to exaggerate the little progress that has been made in the field of nuclear disarmament in the recent past.

With respect to agenda item 5, on the role of science and technology in disarmament, first of all, we regret that the Working Group, despite the tireless efforts of its Chairman, Ambassador Mason, and the secretariat and despite the flexibility shown by some delegations, including ours, was not able to achieve consensus. However, we do not share the view that the work of that Working Group was a total failure. It was successful in that the areas of disagreement were identified, and other bodies at an appropriate time may pick up this item and build upon the achievements made. But these negotiations proved once again that ad hoc regimes engaged in "reinventing the wheel" in disarmament treaties not only undermine the authority of these documents, but also discourage their universality.

With respect to agenda item 6, on international arms transfers, the Working Group held a preliminary exchange of views on, in particular, the scope of this item, and we look forward to constructive and useful deliberations on the item next year.

Finally, in the view of my delegation, lack of consensus on the items on the Commission's agenda should not call into question this body's relevance. This body serves a purpose: the identification of areas of agreement and disagreement. If it can achieve consensus, so much the better; if not, it still reflects the state of affairs and realities. In the light of what happened with regard to annexing the Chairman's paper on the role of science and technology to the report of Working Group II, my delegation calls for a review of document A/CN.10/137, "Ways and Means to enhance the functioning of the United Nations Disarmament Commission", because the Working Group was not able to reach agreement even on how to reflect the state of affairs on that topic, and it finally concluded that it should dismiss the paper and simply confine its consideration to a procedural report. My delegation does not commend that procedure.

These are some of our ideas on the work of the three Working Groups.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement, which contained some very valuable and interesting ideas regarding the work of this Commission and of which I have taken note.

Mr. Shoukry (Egypt): I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to you, Sir, and to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups for the tireless efforts collectively displayed in guiding our work during this session of the Disarmament Commission.

We wish to express our disappointment that neither Working Group I nor Working Group II was able to arrive at a consensus document concerning the items under consideration.

With respect to Working Group I, despite the many achievements that have been witnessed recently in the field of nuclear disarmament, it is unfortunate that there still appears to be on the part of many a lack of political will to address this issue constructively, thereby hindering important progress in this field and in this multilateral forum. We hope that such positions will not have adverse effects on our future efforts to strengthen the

non-proliferation regime and the continuing efforts towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We also regret that Working Group II was unable to arrive at a consensus on the working paper under consideration. The paper contained many useful principles that we would have liked to see formally adopted by this universal body.

Finally, I reiterate our commitment to continue to work actively within the Commission with a view to promoting the recognized objectives of disarmament.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Egypt for the brevity and substance of his statement.

Mr. Stelzer (Austria): It was a great privilege, Mr. Chairman, to try to replace you during your absence. I commend you for the leadership you have displayed at the head of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation also thanks you for your optimism, which you have shared with us and which has very much influenced our work.

I would also like to thank the Chairmen of the Working Groups - Mr. Khandogy, Ambassador Mason and Ambassador Jaramillo - for their leadership and their efforts to steer the Working Groups through waters that were sometimes quite stormy. I would like also to commend the Secretariat staff who supported the work of the Working Groups with experience and diligence.

My delegation has always emphasized the deliberative character of the Disarmament Commission. As was stated by previous speakers, including a departing Vice-Chairman, we have deliberated a great deal this year. We have noted the interest in the work of the Commission at this year's session, and the degree of participation by so many delegations in the work of the Working Groups.

Of course, the deliberations in the three Working Groups were on different levels. Whereas in Working Group III, on international arms transfers, we had the privilege of just starting work - approaching it in general terms then focusing on the scope of the agenda and laying useful groundwork for further deliberations in coming years - the two other Working Groups were mandated to finish their work this year. As we are very well aware, neither Working Group succeeded.

Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, was granted by consensus another year to finish its work.

Whereas we were unable to agree to give the Chairman's paper the status that many delegations desired, I believe that the quality of the paper will serve as a good basis for next year's work.

Unfortunately, Working Group II, on science and technology, will not have another chance to complete its work successfully. In spite of the efforts, the leadership and the tenacity of Ambassador Mason, for which my delegation wholeheartedly commends her, we had to hold the last meeting of the Working Group today; after four years of sincere efforts by so many delegations, we were not even able to agree on the status of where we are leaving the work. Of course, it is the prerogative of each delegation to assess the status of deliberations by its own lights, but it was very disturbing to us that we could not agree to accept the assessment of the Chair and annex her report to the report of the Working Group. We were able merely to list it in our report as one of many documents.

As Ambassador Mason said, this Working Group showed the best and the worst. It failed, but at the same time it gave a good illustration of what the Disarmament Commission is capable of if we all try to overcome national positions and find consensus between opposing positions. This augurs well for the work of the Commission in coming years, and we look forward to next year's deliberations.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Austria for his assistance.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Let me begin by conveying my delegation's gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of the Bureau for the manner in which you have guided the work of the Commission at this session. I also thank the Chairmen of the Working Groups.

As we near the close of the 1994 session, I wish to offer my delegation's impressions of the session. With respect to Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, we believe that there was progress along the lines of efforts that had already been made under the chairmanship of Mr. Khandogy. We hope that these efforts will result in success at the next session.

With respect to Working Group II, on the role of science and technology, I convey to Ambassador Mason of Canada and to the delegation of Brazil our sincere thanks for their efforts at this and previous sessions. This session's deliberations enabled us to build on earlier

progress, and we are convinced that these deliberations will improve our knowledge of this important topic, which will be considered by the First Committee in future sessions.

We are particularly pleased by the enormous progress made in Working Group III, on international arms transfers, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Jaramillo of Colombia, who offered guidelines for the work of the Group that will certainly facilitate future discussions, as well as specific recommendations on this item.

I cannot conclude without reiterating my delegation's commitment to the future of the Disarmament Commission, which must play an increasingly important role in the field of disarmament. Despite the lack of consensus at this session, there are many topics that must be addressed in the best way possible so as to lead to a better understanding of these problems, which are so crucial, affecting as they do the security of all mankind.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I share the optimism of the representative of Algeria about the Commission's future work.

Mr. Fujita (Brazil): Like previous speakers, my delegation would like to express its appreciation to you, Sir, to the other members of the Bureau and to the Chairmen of the Working Groups for the leadership you have displayed during this year's session. We also thank the Secretariat for the invaluable support it provided to our work.

My delegation would like to express its deep disappointment that we did not succeed this year in finalizing the set of guidelines and recommendations on the important question of science and technology, a subject to which my Government attaches very high importance. In any case, my delegation cannot fail to convey its thanks to Ambassador Peggy Mason for her untiring efforts to try to find consensus in our very difficult and delicate task. I thank her and other speakers for their kind words about my delegation. In this regard, I think I am expressing what was a true consensus in Working Group II when I say that it was thanks to her untiring efforts, leadership and dedication, and to the fair and balanced manner in which she conducted our deliberations, that we were able to achieve important progress and almost succeed in finalizing our work.

As to the future of our deliberations on this item, it is the sincere hope of my delegation that the item will continue in one way or another to be discussed and

examined in depth in the United Nations and in other relevant forums.

In this regard, my delegation believes that the final result that we have achieved this year - if not, unfortunately, by consensus, then at least by quasi-consensus - and which is reflected in document CRP.10, the Chairman's proposed annex, will constitute a very important basis for our future work.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I share the optimism of the representative of Brazil about our future work.

Mr. Sukayri (Jordan): Like other delegations which have spoken before me, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the distinctive manner in which you have led our deliberations throughout this substantive session. Allow me also to extend my delegation's appreciation to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups for their relentless efforts to reach consensus. The fact that consensus was not possible in two of the Working Groups does not at all diminish the efforts made by the Chairmen of the Groups, as well as by other participants. This experience has undoubtedly been most useful and will have a positive impact on our work next year. Again, Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate you on all that you have done to bring this session to a conclusion which I certainly consider a substantial step towards success in the future.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I agree with the representative of Jordan about the future of our work.

Ms. Mason (Canada): I should like to echo the praise expressed by all previous speakers before me for your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and for the support of the Bureau and the Secretariat throughout the session.

As I have sat here listening to all the comments that delegations have made, I have found myself rewriting my statement many times, and I hope delegations will bear with me as I move from one section of scribbled handwriting to another.

I turn first to Working Group I. In my statement at this year's opening meeting of the Disarmament Commission, I raised the thorny issue of the scope of the topic before the Group. The process of nuclear disarmament, as is all too evident, is a far-ranging and highly sensitive subject for all countries. It is regrettable that we could not reach consensus this year, in spite of the

leadership demonstrated by the Chairman of Working Group I, Mr. Khandogy. But the lack of consensus was perhaps not totally unexpected, given the related events currently under way in other forums. Canada certainly hopes that the developments in the field of nuclear disarmament anticipated over the next year will serve to enhance the prospects for agreement at next year's session.

With respect to the subject-matter of Working Group III, I should like to congratulate as I did at the outset of our work - through Ambassador Jaramillo and Mrs. Lozano - Colombia once again on its efforts in bringing this item to the Disarmament Commission. As many delegations, mine included, have already noted, this is an ambitious subject and one that will continue to challenge the Commission in the next two years, as it has this year. In our view, the discussion over the past three weeks has served to identify more precisely the concerns of the international community in the area of the illicit transfer of arms, and it is clear to Canada that this subject must be addressed, and in as pragmatic and direct a manner as possible.

In this regard, I recall the briefing that the Centre for Disarmament Affairs gave the Working Group on related efforts in which it is involved, as a result of a request to the Secretary-General from the President of Mali, and the briefing on the margins of Working Group II on the Bonn International Conversion Centre, where a project involving demobilization and disarmament in Africa was highlighted. It seemed to me to be of much interest for delegations.

With regard to Working Group II on science and technology, in addition to my brief comments as Chair, I would only want to add in my national capacity our belief in the need for us to consider carefully in the coming weeks and months how we might best proceed in other forums on the issue of the transfer for peaceful purposes of high technology with military applications in order to build on the progress which has been made in Working Group II, however incomplete that progress may ultimately have been.

In that regard, let me recall that, in my capacity as a member of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, I have been asked to report on appropriate follow-up to the work of the Disarmament Commission in the area of the transfer for peaceful purposes of high technology with military applications at the July meeting of the Advisory Board. I have listened carefully to delegations' comments, and I would certainly welcome further views of delegations on the particular issue of follow-up before the meeting, which

begins on 5 July this year. One thing seems to me to be clear. The issues underlying the work of Working Group II will not go away, and neither should the efforts of the international community to effectively address them.

Before turning to my last series of comments, on the role of the Disarmament Commission as a whole, I might just make one reference to working methods.

This year, for the very first time, in spite of the considerable discipline that it imposed on the Chairs of the Working Groups, we agreed, and stuck to the agreement, that there would be no overlap of either formal or informal meetings of the three Working Groups. The result was that all delegations that wished to participate fully in the work of each Working Group were able to do so. I believe very strongly - Canada believes very strongly - that this is the way we should continue to conduct our work in future.

I would now like to turn very briefly to the broader question of the role of the Disarmament Commission in the light of the results of this year's work - the role of a global deliberative body in an increasingly crisis-oriented environment, that is, the broader international environment. Canada has on many occasions described the two main roles of the Disarmament Commission, but I should like to recall them once again.

The first, of course, has been touched on by many delegations: the role of the Disarmament Commission in building the genuine consensus that is the essential underpinning of global norms, global agreements, global rules of the road, without which it is impossible to promote international cooperation in general or cooperative security-building in particular. That, then, is the first and most clearly understood role of the Disarmament Commission, but I would also like to call attention to the second role, which, as I discussed in my plenary statement, goes beyond the broadening of understanding and the development of common ground, but also seeks to provide concrete tools for States to have at their disposal in global, regional, subregional and even bilateral contexts, tools in the form of broad principles and guidelines which can help countries as they seek to address their particular security concerns in concrete situations.

If we measure those two roles of the Disarmament Commission against the results which we have achieved in Working Group I and Working Group III, we see clearly that we have not been able to carry out fully those two roles. When I was discussing our task in Working Group II in my plenary statement, I said that it was

Canada's very strong view that a meaningful consensus text - that is, one which advances our twin objectives of non-proliferation and peaceful commerce - was within reach, if we could only persevere and find the right balance between what is achievable and what is not.

Clearly, even more perseverance, cooperation and understanding will be required if we are finally to coalesce around what is achievable and set aside what is not. As I said wearing my Chairperson's hat, and I now repeat wearing my national hat, none the less I believe the effort was worthwhile, and I therefore call on all delegations to exhibit in future the perseverance, cooperation and understanding that we saw here.

With respect to our work, however, I should like to refer to a comment made by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran with respect to the document on enhancing the functioning of the Commission and the new rules under which we are operating. As he reminded us, the effect of those new rules was to make possible what did happen in Working Group II. In other words, we realized and we allowed for, under the new rules, the possibility that an item would conclude without consensus after three years, or however many years, of work without unanimous agreement to go further. Clearly, in that respect what happened was envisaged, if not desired, in the new rules.

I think it is equally clear, though, to all delegations that this lack of consensus in the conclusion of an item, while provided for in our rules, is not a precedent that we would wish to follow in future if the Disarmament Commission is to make the contribution that it clearly can make and that the international community expects and needs it to make - a contribution which the representative of New Zealand very accurately described as "practical results in a timely fashion". It is therefore very much Canada's hope and expectation that, in the light of this year's results, every delegation here will recommit itself to the purposes and principles of the Disarmament Commission and to its ability to play its full role in the area of disarmament and international security.

Permit me at this late hour, on a final, very personal note, to thank all delegations and you, Mr. Chairman, once again, for the very kind words that you have directed to me. I could not help noting that one adjective used several times in describing my efforts was "untiring". Every time I heard that adjective I was sure that at one time or another at least one delegation in Working Group II would have been more inclined to describe my efforts as "tiresome in the extreme" rather than "untiring". None the less, I want

to reiterate what an extreme privilege it has been to chair Working Group II and to participate in all of the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission this year.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I still think of Ambassador Peggy Mason as the "tireless" Chairman of Working Group II. She has been extremely committed to her work; she worked right up to the very last minute to attempt to arrive at a consensus. She was not able to do that, but the progress she achieved will be enshrined in the annals of the work of our Commission.

Other business

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I understand that a number of delegations have expressed their concern about the dates of the 1995 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, as the traditional dates for the Disarmament Commission have been allocated to the forthcoming Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which is to be held from 17 April to 12 May 1995. In this connection, it would seem logical and advisable to tentatively schedule the 1995 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission for immediately after the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, namely, from 15 May to 5 June 1995, for a period of three weeks and one day - that is, the same duration as in 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994. Of course, it is understood that the Conference on Disarmament may consider adjusting its schedule in 1995 so that the meetings of these two important disarmament bodies do not overlap.

The rationale for scheduling those dates for the 1995 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is the assumption that the Commission's deliberations on nuclear disarmament next year could benefit from the results of the NPT Conference on a wide range of nuclear issues, so that consideration of that item would be concluded in 1995. However, it should be pointed out that the tentative schedule for the 1995 substantive session is rather indicative, in order to facilitate the work of the Committee on Conferences in its overall consideration of meetings and conference arrangements. In accordance with its reform programme, the Disarmament Commission will make the final decision on the date and the duration of its 1995 substantive session at its 1994 organizational session, to be held in early December this year.

At the meeting of the Expanded Bureau held on Friday morning, 6 May, members of the Bureau agreed on the above tentative date and duration for the 1995 substantive

session, namely, from 15 May to 5 June 1995, for a period of three weeks and one day.

As there are no objections or comments, I take it that the Disarmament Commission wishes to tentatively schedule its 1995 substantive session from 15 May to 5 June 1995.

It was so decided.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): At this late hour, I do not wish to impose a statement on the members of the Commission. I will simply refer to the outstanding statements made by many representatives, statements which I have noted and from which I have drawn some lessons.

I have observed that all delegations have come to the conclusion that our work may appear disappointing. But those delegations are not discouraged. They have expressed the hope that the work can be concluded at the next session of the Commission.

In any event, it is clear that Working Group II has concluded its work. Success was made possible thanks to the outstanding efforts of its Chairman of the Group, Mrs. Peggy Mason, with the assistance of every delegation, in particular that of the delegation of Brazil. Every member has emphasized this, and on behalf of all of them I congratulate Mrs. Mason and the Brazilian delegation. Indeed, I congratulate all members of this Working Group, as a great deal of determination was required to arrive at its results.

I do not wish to forget Working Group I, which was guided in outstanding fashion by my friend Mr. Khandogy, a very competent successor to our friend Victor Batiouk. As everyone noted, the Group was dealing with a very delicate subject. As I stated a few moments ago, we feel that in 1995 we will be able to arrive at more concrete results. There is no cause for discouragement here either.

The preliminary work accomplished by Working Group III was guided in remarkable fashion by my friend Luis Fernando Jaramillo, Permanent Representative of Colombia, assisted by the charming Mrs. Lozano, who brought all her talent and all her intelligence to the task of assuring progress in their work and producing a Chairman's paper, which can be expanded upon during the next session of our Commission.

I would like to be optimistic, as most delegations are, and quote a great man - I think it was President

Franklin Delano Roosevelt - who said that you need not hope in order to try, nor succeed in order to persevere. It is in this spirit that we must continue to work, showing our Governments' political will to arrive at concrete results, as was so well expressed by the representative of Jordan earlier today.

We are approaching the end of this session. I wish to express my deep gratitude to all the Vice-Chairmen of the Commission - and particularly to the representative of Austria, who had the onerous task of replacing me when I was absent - and to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups, Mr. Khandogy, Mrs. Peggy Mason and Mr. Luis Fernando Jaramillo. As I said a few moments ago, they did excellent work, which was appreciated by all. I associate myself with the tribute to them by Mr. José Manuel Ovalle of Chile, who, with characteristic discretion, produced a report which we adopted with little debate.

I am sure that members of the Commission will also join me in sincerely thanking the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic, who is currently on mission and who has written expressing his regret at not being able to join us today. He is none the less very well represented today by our friend, the Deputy Director, Mr. Kheradi, whom we all know; we were familiar with his careful work in the First Committee, and we have been fortunate to have the benefit of his advice and experience.

Thanks should particularly go to the Secretary of the Disarmament Commission, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, and to his colleagues. Without them we would never have had such well-produced documents and all the technical information that enabled us to hold responsible discussions. I greatly appreciate their assistance to me and the other members of the Bureau.

On behalf of the members of the Commission, I also thank the interpreters, who often generously gave us extra time to try to reach consensus or agreement on a particular point. I also thank all the other conference services personnel for their discreet but efficient work. Thanks to them, we have had documents on time and in every language. I am quite demanding when it comes to the distribution of documents, and I must say that I was not at all disappointed by the work of those concerned. Finally, I would like to thank all those others who have provided support in one way or another during this session of the Commission.

To those preparing to leave New York and to head home, I say "Bon voyage". Those who will remain in New York with us I wish the best of luck in fighting other battles on other fronts.

Closure of the session

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I declare the 1994 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.